

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8

9 United States of America,

10 Plaintiff

11 v.

12 Robert Kane et al.,

13 Defendants
14

Case No.: 2:13-cr-250-JAD-VCF

**Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration of
Magistrate Judge's Order Denying Motion to
Modify Conditions of Pre-Trial Release
[Doc. 118]**

15 Robert Coleman is one of six defendants in this criminal-conspiracy action. On July 1, 2014,
16 Coleman and four of his codefendants filed a motion seeking modification of their pretrial-release
17 conditions.¹ Their four-page motion argued that, because they faced a “patchwork” of different
18 conditions on their associations with each other, they should be allowed uniform restrictions bringing
19 them “up to the highest level of association prohibition.”² Magistrate Judge Hoffman noted that “[i]t
20 is not unusual for co-defendants in a criminal case to have different conditions of release.”³ He
21 denied Coleman’s motion on September 10, 2014, because Coleman failed to provide any legal
22
23
24

25 ¹ Doc. 110.

26 ² *Id.* at 2–3.

27 ³ Doc. 115 at 3.
28

1 rationale for modification beyond baldly citing 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c)(1)(B).⁴

2 Coleman now timely appeals from the Magistrate Judge's decision.⁵ This motion is even
3 shorter than Coleman's original motion for modification of his pretrial-release conditions; at three
4 pages it, too, fails to cite any legal authority beyond "18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(B)."⁶ And while Coleman
5 argues that Magistrate Judge Hoffman's order is "clearly erroneous," he continues merely arguing
6 that the "patchwork of conditions is in no way justified."⁷ He provides no new legal arguments. I do
7 not find any basis in either § 3142(e)(1)(B) or § 3142(e)(2)(B), or indeed, anywhere else in § 3142 to
8 modify Coleman's release conditions. And there is nothing inherently problematic with Coleman
9 and his codefendants receiving different pretrial-release conditions.

10 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that defendant Robert Coleman's motion for review and
11 appeal from order denying motion to modify conditions of pre-trial release **[Doc. 118] is DENIED.**

12 DATED October 21, 2014.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Jennifer A. Dorsey
United States District Judge

23 ⁴ *Id.* at 2–3; *cf.* Doc. 110 at 4. Three different magistrate judges ruled on the moving defendants'
24 requests for modification because each of these magistrate judges set the various defendants' original
pretrial-release conditions. *See* Docs. 115, 116, 119.

25 ⁵ Doc. 118.

26 ⁶ *Id.* at 2.

27 ⁷ *Id.* at 1–2.